arXiv:1108.0774v2 [math.FA] 16 Feb 2012

DILATIONS OF Γ-CONTRACTIONS BY SOLVING OPERATOR EQUATIONS

TIRTHANKAR BHATTACHARYYA, SOURAV PAL, AND SUBRATA SHYAMROY

ABSTRACT. For a contraction P and a bounded commutant S of P, we seek a solution X of the operator equation

$$S - S^*P = (I - P^*P)^{\frac{1}{2}} X (I - P^*P)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where X is a bounded operator on $\overline{\text{Ran}}(I-P^*P)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with numerical radius of X being not greater than 1. A pair of bounded operators (S,P) which has the domain

$$\Gamma = \{(z_1+z_2, z_1z_2) : |z_1| \le 1, |z_2| \le 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$$

as a spectral set, is called a Γ-contraction in the literature. We show the existence and uniqueness of solution to the operator equation above for a Γ-contraction (S,P). This allows us to construct an explicit Γ-isometric dilation of a Γ-contraction (S,P). We prove the other way too, i.e, for a commuting pair (S,P) with $\|P\| \le 1$ and the spectral radius of S being not greater than 2, the existence of a solution to the above equation implies that (S,P) is a Γ-contraction. We show that for a pure Γ-contraction (S,P), there is a bounded operator C with numerical radius not greater than 1, such that $S = C + C^*P$. Any Γ-isometry can be written in this form where P now is an isometry commuting with C and C^*. Any Γ-unitary is of this form as well with P and C being commuting unitaries. Examples of Γ-contractions on reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and their Γ-isometric dilations are discussed.

1. MOTIVATION

Subsets of $\mathbb{C}^n$ that are spectral sets or complete spectral sets for a given commuting n-tuple of operators have been studied for a long time, see [21] and the many references cited there for the historical development.

Agler and Young in their seminal paper [1] introduced the novel idea of studying all commuting pairs of bounded operators for which a certain particular subset of $\mathbb{C}^2$ is a spectral set. This subset is the symmetrized bidisc

$$\Gamma = \{(z_1+z_2, z_1z_2) : |z_1| \le 1, |z_2| \le 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$$

and the commuting pair of bounded operators (S,P) defined on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ satisfies

$$\|f(S,P)\| \le \sup_{(z_1,z_2)\in\Gamma} |f(z_1,z_2)|$$

where f is a polynomial in two variables and the supremum is over Γ. Thus, Γ is a spectral set for (S,P) or in other words (S,P) is a Γ- contraction. A Γ- contraction (S,P) is said to be a *pure* Γ-contraction if P is a pure contraction, i.e, $P^{*n} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. In other words $P \in C_{\cdot 0}$ following the terminology of Sz-Nagy and Foias (see page-76 of [20]). In their paper ([6]), Agler and Young described the motivation for studying Γ-contractions. An understanding of this family of operator pairs has led to the solutions of a special case of the spectral

---

The first author was supported in part by a grant from UGC via DSA-SAP and UKIERI funded by the British Council and the second author was supported by Research Fellowship of Council of Science and Industrial Research, India and UKIERI..

Nevanlinna-Pick problem([3], [5]), which is one of the problems that arise in H^∞ control theory([16]). Also they play a pivotal role in the study of complex geometry of the set Γ(see [4]). In their work Agler and Young did not assume separability of Hilbert spaces, but in this note, all Hilbert spaces are over complex numbers and are separable.

The remarkably smooth theory that they developed for Γ-contractions parallels the highly successful theory of dilation of a single contraction because they showed in ([6]), the existence of a Γ-isometric dilation for any Γ-contraction. In this note we construct an explicit Γ-isometric dilation of a Γ-contraction, i.e, given a Γ-contraction (S,P) on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$, we construct a space $\mathscr{K}$ containing $\mathscr{H}$ as a subspace and a Γ-isometry (T,V) on $\mathscr{K}$ such that $T^*|_{\mathscr{H}} = S^*$ and $V^*|_{\mathscr{H}} = P^*$. In other words, a Γ-contraction is the compression of a Γ-isometry to a co-invariant subspace. What is remarkable here is that the space $\mathscr{K}$ need not be any bigger than the minimal isometric dilation space of the contraction P and V is in fact the minimal isometric dilation of P. Moreover, T, in such a case, is uniquely determined.

There are several ways to describe a Γ-contraction. We have described a new way of characterizing Γ-contractions in section 4. To do it, we define the fundamental equation of a pair of bounded operators (S,P) with $||P|| \leq 1$, to be the operator equation

$$S - S^*P = \mathbf{D}_P X \mathbf{D}_P, \quad X \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_P).$$

We show in the section on dilation, the existence and uniqueness of solution to the fundamental equation for a Γ-contraction (S,P) and call the solution, the fundamental operator for (S,P). Uniqueness of minimal Γ-isometric dilation (the minimality of a Γ-isometric dilation is defined in section-2) of a Γ-contraction follows from the uniqueness of the solution. This relates the theory of Γ-contractions beautifully to solving operator equations. A one-parameter family of examples of Γ-contractions has been obtained and is discussed in section 3. Their underlying spaces are reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. We give Γ-isometric dilations of those Γ-contractions. Section 2 describes the structure of Γ-unitaries and Γ-isometries in complete detail with some new characterizations of them.

We start by listing, without proof, some basic facts about the set Γ all of which can be found in [6]. These will be frequently used.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $(s,p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. The following are equivalent:*

(i) $(s,p) \in \Gamma$*;*
(ii) $|s - \bar{s}p| + |p^2| \leq 1$ *and* $|s| \leq 2$*;*
(iii) $2|s - \bar{s}p| + |s^2 - 4p| + |s^2| \leq 4$*;*
(iv) $\rho(\alpha s, \alpha^2 p) \geq 0$ *, for all* $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$*, where* $\mathbb{D}$ *is the unit open disc in* $\mathbb{C}$*;*
(v) $|p| \leq 1$ *and there exists* $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ *such that* $|\beta| \leq 1$ *and* $s = \beta + \bar{\beta}p$*;*
(vi) $|s| \leq 2$ *and* $|(2\alpha p - s)(2 - \alpha s)^{-1}| \leq 1$ *for all* $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$*;*
(vii) $1 - \bar{\alpha}s + \bar{\alpha}^2 p \neq 0$ *and* $|(p - \alpha s + \alpha^2)(1 - \bar{\alpha}s + \bar{\alpha}^2 p)^{-1}| \leq 1$ *for all* $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$ *.*

Definition 1.2. *The distinguished boundary of the set* Γ*, denoted by* $b\Gamma$ *is defined to be the set*

$$b\Gamma = \{(z_1 + z_2, z_1 z_2) : |z_1| = |z_2| = 1\}.$$

This is the Šilov boundary of the algebra of functions continuous on Γ and analytic in the interior of Γ.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(s,p) \in \mathbb{C}^2$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) $(s,p) \in b\Gamma$;

(2) $(s,p)=(2xe^{i\frac{\theta}{2}},e^{i\theta})$ *for some* $\theta\in\mathbb{R}$, *and* $x\in[-1,1]$.
(3) $|p|=1$, $s=\bar{s}p$ *and* $|s|\leq 2$.
(4) $|p|=1$, $s=\beta+\bar{\beta}p$ *for some* $\beta\in\mathbb{C}$ *of modulus* 1.

We give a proof of (1) ⟺ (4) because we could not locate it in literature.

Proof. Let $|p|=1$ and $s=\beta+\bar{\beta}p$ for some $\beta\in\mathbb{C}$ of modulus 1. Taking $z_1=\beta$ and $z_2=\bar{\beta}p$ we see that $s=z_1+z_2$ and $p=z_1z_2$ where clearly $|z_1|=|z_2|=1$. Hence $(s,p)\in b\Gamma$. Conversely, let $(s,p)\in b\Gamma$. Then $s=z_1+z_2$ and $p=z_1z_2$ for some z_1,z_2 of modulus 1. Clearly $|p|=1$ and $z_2=\bar{z_1}p$. Thus we have $s=z_1+\bar{z_1}p=\beta+\bar{\beta}p$, where $\beta=z_1$. ☐

Lemma 1.4. Γ *is polynomially convex but not convex.*

There are more results about Γ that we are not going into because those are not relevant here. Symmetrized polydisc has been studied in detail. The interested reader is referred to [2], [4], [7], [15].

2. STRUCTURE THEOREMS FOR Γ−ISOMETRIES AND Γ−UNITARIES

Ever since Sz.-Nagy found the minimal unitary dilation for a contraction on a Hilbert space, it became clear how powerful a tool it is for studying an arbitrary contraction. An operator T is a contraction if and only if $\|p(T)\|\leq\|p\|_\infty$ for all polynomials p by von Neumann's inequality. This property can be isolated and a compact subset X of $\mathbb{C}$ is called a spectral set for an operator T if

$$\|f(T)\|\leq\sup_{z\in X}\|f(z)\| \tag{2.1}$$

for all rational functions $f(z)$ with poles off X (we bring in rational functions instead of just polynomials because the domain X is assumed to be just compact and not necessarily simply connected, unlike $\mathbb{D}$). If (2.1) holds for all matrix valued rational functions f, then X is called a complete spectral set for T. Moreover, T is said to have a normal ∂X-dilation if there is a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a subspace and a normal operator N on $\mathcal{K}$ with $\sigma(N)\subseteq\partial X$ such that

$$f(T)=P_{\mathcal{H}}f(N)|_{\mathcal{H}},$$

for all rational functions f with poles off X. It is a remarkable consequence of Arveson's extension theorem that X is a complete spectral set for T if and only if T has a normal ∂X-dilation. Rephrased in this language, Sz.-Nagy dilation theorem says that if $\mathbb{D}$ is a spectral set for T then T has a normal $\partial\mathbb{D}$-dilation. For T to have a normal ∂X-dilation it is necessary that X be a spectral set for T. Sufficiency has been investigated for many domains in $\mathbb{C}$ and several interesting results are known including failure of such a dilation in multiply connected domains [13]. If $X\subseteq\mathbb{C}^2$, then the questions are much more subtle. If (T_1,T_2) is a commuting pair of operators for which $\mathbb{D}^2$ is a spectral set, then (T_1,T_2) has a simultaneous commuting unitary dilation by Ando's theorem. Taking cue from such classically beautiful concepts, Agler and Young introduced the following definitions.

Definition 2.1. *A commuting pair* (S,P) *is called a* Γ-unitary *if* S *and* P *are normal operators and the joint spectrum* $\sigma(S,P)$ *of* (S,P) *is contained in the distinguished boundary of* Γ.

Definition 2.2. *A commuting pair* (S,P) *is called a* Γ*-isometry if there exist a Hilbert space* $\mathcal{N}$ *containing* $\mathcal{H}$ *and a* Γ*-unitary* $(\tilde{S},\tilde{P})$ *on* $\mathcal{N}$ *such that* $\mathcal{H}$ *is left invariant by both* $\tilde{S}$ *and* $\tilde{P}$*, and*

$$S=\tilde{S}|_{\mathcal{H}} \text{ and } P=\tilde{P}|_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

In other words, $(\tilde{S},\tilde{P})$ *is a* Γ*-unitary extension of* (S,P)*. A commuting pair* (S,P) *is a* Γ-co-isometry *if* (S^*,P^*) *is a* Γ*-isometry. Moreover, a* Γ*-isometry* (S,P) *is said to be a pure* Γ*-isometry if* P *is a pure isometry, i.e, there is no non trivial subspace of* $\mathcal{H}$ *on which* P *acts as a unitary operator.*

Here and henceforth, when we say joint spectrum, we shall mean the Taylor joint spectrum unless otherwise mentioned. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(S,P) &= 2(I-P^*P)-(S-S^*P)-(S^*-P^*S)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\{(2-S)^*(2-S)-(2P-S)^*(2P-S)\}.\end{aligned}$$

The following result was proved in [1]. There, in fact, it was proved that positivity $\rho(S,P)$ is a necessary and sufficient condition for (S,P) to be a Γ-contraction. A straightforward proof of one direction is given below using joint spectral theory. Stinespring dilation is avoided for proving this because this result will be used for constructing explicit dilations.

Proposition 2.3. *Let* (S,P) *be a* Γ*-contraction. Then* $\rho(\alpha S,\alpha^2 P)\geq 0$*, for all* $\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{D}}$*.*

Proof. Let $\sigma(S,P)$ denote the Taylor joint spectrum of (S,P). By Lemma 6.11 of Chapter-III of [23],

$$\sigma(S,P)\subset \sigma_{\mathcal{U}}(S,P),$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ is the *Banach subalgebra* of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, generated by S,P and I and $\sigma_{\mathcal{U}}(S,P)$ is the joint spectrum of (S,P) relative to this commutative Banach algebra.
It is straightforward from the definition of Γ contraction that

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{U}}(S,P)\subseteq\Gamma,$$

and hence we have $\sigma(S,P)\subseteq\Gamma$.
Let f be a holomorphic function in a neighbourhood of Γ. Since Γ is polynomially convex, by Oka-Weil theorem (Theorem 5.1 of [17]) there exists a sequence of polynomials $\{p_n\}$ that converges uniformly to f on Γ. So by Theorem 9.9 of Chapter-III of [23] we have

$$p_n(S,P)\to f(S,P)$$

which by virtue of (S,P) being a Γ-contraction implies that

$$\|f(S,P)\|=\lim_{n\to\infty}\|p_n(S,P)\|\leq\lim_{n\to\infty}\|p_n\|_{\Gamma}=\|f\|.$$

Using the function $f(s,p)=(2\alpha^2 p-\alpha s)/(2-\alpha s)$ which is holomorphic in a neighbourhood of Γ for $\alpha\in\mathbb{D}$, we get

$$\|(2\alpha^2P-\alpha S)(2-\alpha S)^{-1}\|\leq\|f\|_{\Gamma}\leq 1.$$

Thus $(2-\alpha S)^{*-1}(2\alpha^2P-\alpha S)^*(2\alpha^2P-\alpha S)(2-\alpha S)^{-1}\leq I$.
This happens if and only if $(2-\alpha S)^*(2-\alpha S)\geq(2\alpha^2P-\alpha S)^*(2\alpha^2P-\alpha S)$. By definition of $\rho(S,P)$, the last inequality is the same as $\rho(\alpha S,\alpha^2P)\geq 0$.
By continuity, $\rho(\alpha S,\alpha^2P)\geq 0$ for all $\alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. ☐

It is clear from the definition that if (S_1, P_1) and (S_2, P_2) are Γ-unitaries, then so is the direct sum $(S, P) = (S_1 \oplus S_2, P_1 \oplus P_2)$. Indeed, the joint spectrum of (S, P) is the union of the joint spectrum of (S_1, P_1) and the joint spectrum of (S_2, P_2) (see [10]). We begin with an elementary lemma whose proof we skip because it is routine.

Lemma 2.4. *Let X be a bounded operator on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. If $Re\, \beta X \leq 0$ for all complex numbers β of modulus 1, then $X = 0$.*

Parts of the following theorem, which gives new characterizations of Γ-unitaries were obtained by Agler and Young in ([6]). Parts (3), (4) and (5) are new.

Theorem 2.5. *Let (S, P) be a pair of commuting operators defined on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *(S, P) is a Γ-unitary ;*
2. *there exist commuting unitary operators U_1 and U_2 on $\mathscr{H}$ such that*
$$S = U_1 + U_2, \quad P = U_1 U_2\,;$$
3. *P is unitary, $S = S^*P$, and $r(S) \leq 2$, where $r(S)$ is the spectral radius of S.*
4. *(S, P) is a Γ-contraction and P is a unitary.*
5. *P is a unitary and $S = U + U^*P$ for some unitary U commuting with P.*

Remark 2.6. *We draw attention to the similarity between part(5) of this theorem and part(4) of Theorem 1.3.*

Proof. $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ This proof is the same as the one given by Agler and Young in [6]. We include it for the sake of completeness. Let (S, P) be a Γ-unitary. By the spectral theorem for commuting normal operators there exists a spectral measure say $M(.)$ on $\sigma(S, P)$ such that

$$S = \int_{\sigma(S,P)} p_1(z) M(dz), \quad P = \int_{\sigma(S,P)} p_2(z) M(dz),$$

where $p_1,\ p_2$ are the co-ordinate functions on $\mathbb{C}^2$. Now choose a measurable right inverse β of the restriction of the function π to $\mathbb{T}^2$ so that β maps the distinguished boundary $b\Gamma$ of Γ to $\mathbb{T}^2$. Let $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ and

$$U_j = \int_{\sigma(S,P)} \beta_j(z) M(dz), \quad j = 1, 2.$$

Then U_1, U_2 are commuting unitary operators on $\mathscr{H}$ and

$$U_1 + U_2 = \int_{\sigma(S,P)} (\beta_1 + \beta_2)(z) M(dz) = \int_{\sigma(S,P)} p_1(z) M(dz) = S.$$

Similarly $U_1 U_2 = P$. Thus $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$.
$(2) \Rightarrow (3)$ is clear.
$(3) \Rightarrow (1)$ We have $P^*P = PP^* = I$ and $S = S^*P$. Therefore, $S^* = P^*S$ and as a consequence

$$SS^* = (S^*P)(P^*S) = S^*S$$

as P is unitary. So (S, P) is a commuting pair of normal operators. So we have $r(S) = \|S\|$. Let $C^*(S, P)$ be the commutative C^*-algebra generated by them. By general theory of joint spectrum (see p-27, Proposition 1.2 of [10]),

$$\sigma(S, P) = \{(\varphi(S), \varphi(P)) : \varphi \in \mathscr{M}\},$$

where $\mathcal{M}$ is the maximal ideal space of $C^*(S,P)$. Let $(s,p)=(\psi(S),\psi(P))\in\sigma(S,P)$, where $\psi\in\mathcal{M}$. Then

$$|p|^2=\overline{p}p=\overline{\psi(p)}\psi(p)=\psi(P^*)\psi(P)=\psi(P^*P)=\psi(I)=1$$

and

$$\overline{s}p=\overline{\psi(S)}\psi(P)=\psi(S^*P)=\psi(S)=s.$$

Also $|s|=|\psi(S)|\leq\|S\|=r(S)\leq 2$. Therefore, by Theorem 1.3, $(s,p)\in b\Gamma$ i.e, $\sigma(S,P)\subseteq b\Gamma$. So (S,P) is a Γ-unitary. Hence (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1).
Thus (1), (2) and (3) are equivalent.
The implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (4) is trivial.
(4) $\Rightarrow$ (3) depends on the fact that if (S,P) is a Γ-contraction, then

$$\rho(\alpha S,\alpha^2 P)\geq 0\,,\qquad \text{for all } \alpha\in\overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

Therefore, for $\beta\in\mathbb{T}$, we have $\rho(\beta S,\beta^2P)=2(I-P^*P)-\beta(S-S^*P)-\overline{\beta}(S^*-P^*S)\geq 0$. Using the fact that $P^*P=I$, we get that Re $\beta(S-S^*P)\leq 0$. By invoking Lemma 2.4 now, we get that $S-S^*P=0$. Also since (S,P) is a Γ-contraction, $r(S)\leq\|S\|\leq 2$. Hence done.
(2) $\Rightarrow$ (5) follows as $S=U_1+U_2=U_1+U_1^*P$ and $U_1P=U_1U_1U_2=U_1U_2U_1=PU_1$.
(5) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows by taking $U_1=U$ and $U_2=U^*P$.

□

Corollary 2.7. *The pair (S,I) can be a Γ-contraction only by being a Γ-unitary. It is so if and only if S is a self-adjoint operator of spectral radius not bigger than 2.*

During the course of the proof, we used something which we segregate as a separate result because it will be used later too.

Observation 2.8. *If P is a unitary, S commutes with P and $S=S^*P$, then S is normal.*

The structure of Γ-isometries can be deciphered using numerical radius. We recall the definitions of *numerical range* and *numerical radius* and discuss some of their properties which will be useful. The *numerical range* of an operator T on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is defined to be

$$\Omega(T)=\{\langle Tx,x\rangle\,:\,\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}}\leq 1\}.$$

The *numerical radius* of T is defined as

$$\omega(T)=\sup\{|\langle Tx,x\rangle|\,:\,\|x\|_{\mathcal{H}}\leq 1\}.$$

It is well known that $r(T)\leq\omega(T)\leq\|T\|$ for a bounded operator T. An elementary fact will be used more than once, and hence we state it as a lemma followed by a remarkable result due to Ando.

Lemma 2.9. *The numerical radius of an operator X is not greater than one if and only if Re $\beta X\leq I$ for all complex numbers β of modulus 1.*

Proof. It is obvious that $\omega(X)\leq 1$ implies that Re $\beta X\leq I$ for all $\beta\in\mathbb{T}$. We prove the other way. By hypothesis, $\langle$Re $\beta Xh,h\rangle\leq 1$ for all $h\in\mathcal{H}$ with $\|h\|\leq 1$ and for all $\beta\in\mathbb{T}$. Note that $\langle$Re $\beta Xh,h\rangle=$ Re $\beta\langle Xh,h\rangle$. Write $\langle Xh,h\rangle=e^{i\varphi_h}|\langle Xh,h\rangle|$ for some $\varphi_h\in\mathbb{R}$, and then choose $\beta=e^{-i\varphi_h}$. Then we get $|\langle Xh,h\rangle|\leq 1$ and this holds for each $h\in\mathcal{H}$ with $\|h\|\leq 1$. Hence done. □

Theorem 2.10. ***(Ando):*** *The numerical radius of an operator X is not greater than one if and only if there is a contraction C such that*

$$X = 2(I - C^*C)^{1/2}C.$$

For details of the proof, see Theorem 2 of [8].

Definition 2.11. *A bounded operator X is said to be hyponormal if $X^*X \geq XX^*$.*

Proposition 2.12. ***(Stampfli):*** *If X is hyponormal, then $\|X^n\| = \|X\|^n$ and so $\|X\| = r(X)$.*

For details of the proof see Proposition 4.6 of [9].

Lemma 2.13. *Let U , V be a unitary and a pure isometry on Hilbert Spaces $\mathscr{H}_1$, $\mathscr{H}_2$ respectively, and let $X : \mathscr{H}_1 \to \mathscr{H}_2$ be such that $XU = VX$. Then $X = 0$.*

Proof. We have , for any positive integer n, $XU^n = V^nX$ by iteration. Therefore, $U^{*n}X^* = X^*V^{*n}$. Thus X^* vanishes on $KerV^{*n}$, and since $\bigcup\limits_n KerV^{*n}$ is dense in $\mathscr{H}_2$ we have $X^* = 0$ $i.e$, $X = 0$. □

Theorem 2.14. *Let S, P be commuting operators on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. The following statements are all equivalent:*

(1) (S,P) is a Γ-isometry,
(2) (S,P) is a Γ-contraction and P is isometry,
(3) P is an isometry , $S = S^*P$ and $r(S) \leq 2$,
(4) $r(S) \leq 2$ and $\rho(\beta S, \beta^2 P) = 0$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$.
Moreover if the spectral radius $r(S)$ of S is less than 2 then (1),(2),(3) and (4) are equivalent to:
(5) $(2\beta P - S)(2 - \beta S)^{-1}$ is an isometry, for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$.

Proof. (1)⇒(2) is obvious.
(2)⇒(3) The fact that (S,P) is a Γ-contraction implies that $\|S\| \leq 2$, whence $r(S) \leq 2$. It also implies that $\rho(\alpha S, \alpha^2 P) \geq 0$ for all α in the closed disk, in particular on the circle. In view of P being an isometry, this means that

$$\text{Re}\, \beta(S - S^*P) \leq 0$$

for all β of modulus 1. By using Lemma 2.4, we get that $S = S^*P$.
(3)⇒(4) This is obvious.
(4)⇒(1) We have

$$\rho(\beta S, \beta^2 P) = 2(I - P^*P) - \beta(S - S^*P) - \overline{\beta}(S^* - P^*S) = 0 \text{ for all } \beta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Putting $\beta = 1$ and $\beta = -1$, we get $P^*P = I$ from which it follows by the same argument as above that $S = S^*P$. We shall now show that (S,P) is a Γ-isometry by exhibiting a Γ-unitary extension.
Wold decomposition of the isometry P breaks the whole space $\mathscr{H}$ into the direct sum of two reducing subspaces $\mathscr{H}_1$ and $\mathscr{H}_2$ so that P has the form

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} P_1 & 0 \\ 0 & P_2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathscr{H}_1 \oplus \mathscr{H}_2 = \mathscr{H},$$

where P_1 is a unitary and P_2 is a pure isometry (a shift of some multiplicity). With respect to this decomposition of $\mathscr{H}$, we write

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_{11} & S_{12} \\ S_{21} & S_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By commutativity of S and P and applying Lemma 2.13, we see that S takes the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} S_1 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{on } \mathscr{H}_1 \oplus \mathscr{H}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad S_1P_1 = P_1S_1\,,\, S_2P_2 = P_2S_2.$$

Also by $S = S^*P$ and $P^*P = I$ we get $S_i = S_i^*P_i$ and $P_i^*P_i = I$ respectively for $i = 1,2$.
The pair (S_1, P_1) is Γ-unitary by part (4) of Theorem 2.5 because P_1 is unitary and restriction of a Γ-contraction to an invariant subspace is a Γ-contraction.
The pair (S_2, P_2) is a Γ-contraction since (S, P) is so. Since P_2 is a pure isometry it can be identified with the multiplication operator M_z^E on $H^2(E)$ for some Hilbert space E. Again since S_2 commutes with $P_2 (\equiv M_z^E)$, it can be identified with the multiplication operator M_φ^E for some $\varphi \in H^\infty(\mathscr{B}(E))$.
Also because P_2 is isometry, $I - P_2P_2^* \geq 0$ and we have

$$S_2^*(I - P_2P_2^*)S_2 \geq 0 \Rightarrow S_2^*S_2 \geq (S_2^*P_2)(P_2^*S_2) = S_2S_2^*, \text{ since } S_2 = S_2^*P_2.$$

Thus S_2 is hyponormal and by Stampfli's result (Theorem 2.12), $r(S_2) = \|S_2\|$ and hence $\|\varphi\| = \|M_\varphi^E\| = \|S_2\| \leq 2$. Since $S_2 = S_2{}^*P_2$, or equivalently $M_\varphi^E = M_\varphi^{E*}M_z^E$, we have

$$\varphi(z) = \varphi^*(z)z \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Consider on $L^2(E)$, the multiplication operators U_φ^E and U_z^E, multiplication by $\varphi(z)$ and z respectively. Obviously U_z^E is a unitary operator on $L^2(E)$. Since $\varphi(z) = \varphi^*(z)z$ we have $U_\varphi^E = U_\varphi^{E*}U_z^E$, i.e, $U_\varphi^{E*} = U_z^{E*}U_\varphi^E$ and hence

$$U_\varphi^E U_\varphi^{E*} = (U_\varphi^{E*}U_z^E)(U_z^{E*}U_\varphi{}^E) = U_\varphi^{E*}U_\varphi^E$$

and thus U_φ^E is normal. So we have a pair of commuting normal operators (U_φ^E, U_z^E) on $L^2(E))$ such that $r(U_\varphi^E) = \|U_\varphi^E\| = \|\varphi\| \leq 2$, $U_\varphi^E = U_\varphi^{E*}U_z^E$ and U_z^E is unitary. Therefore by part (3) of Theorem 2.5, (U_φ^E, U_z^E) is a Γ-unitary. The restriction to $H^2(E)$ of this Γ-unitary is (M_φ^E, M_z^E). In other words (U_φ^E, U_z^E) is a Γ-unitary extension of (M_φ^E, M_z^E).
Taking $\tilde{S} = S_1 \oplus U_\varphi^E$ and $\tilde{P} = P_1 \oplus U_z^E$ on $\mathscr{H}_1 \oplus L^2(E)$, we see that $(\tilde{S}, \tilde{P})$ is a Γ-unitary extension of (S, P). Hence (S, P) is a Γ-isometry.
Thus (1) through (4) are equivalent.
(4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5) By hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho(\beta S, \beta^2 P) = \frac{1}{2}\{(2 - \beta S)^*(2 - \beta S) - (2\beta^2 P - \beta S)^*(2\beta^2 P - \beta S)\} = 0. \\ &\Rightarrow (2 - \beta S)^*(2 - \beta S) = (2\beta^2 P - \beta S)^*(2\beta^2 P - \beta S). \end{aligned}$$

Since $r(S) < 2$, the operator $2 - \beta S$ is invertible. Therefore, we have

$$((2 - \beta S)^{-1})^*(2\beta^2 P - \beta S)^*(2\beta^2 P - \beta S)(2 - \beta S)^{-1} = I.$$

Therefore $(2\beta^2 P - \beta S)(2 - \beta S)^{-1}$ and hence $(2\beta P - S)(2 - \beta S)^{-1}$ is an isometry for all $\beta \in \mathbb{T}$.

Conversely, let (5) hold. Then $(2\beta^2P-\beta S)(2-\beta S)^{-1}$ is an isometry for every $\beta\in\mathbb{T}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&((2-\beta S)^{-1})^*(2\beta^2P-\beta S)^*(2\beta^2P-\beta S)(2-\beta S)^{-1}=I\\ \text{or}\quad&(2-\beta S)^*(2-\beta S)-(2\beta^2P-\beta S)^*(2\beta^2P-\beta S)=0\\ \text{or}\quad&\rho(\beta S,\beta^2P)=0\,,\quad\forall\,\beta\in\mathbb{T}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence done. □

Note 2.15. *The* Γ*-isometry* (S_2,P_2) *in the above proof is a* pure Γ-isometry.

Corollary 2.16. *If* (S,P) *is a* Γ*-isometry (respectively a* Γ*-unitary), then* (rS,P) *is also a* Γ*-isometry (respectively a* Γ*-unitary) for* $0\le r\le 1$.

The following two results are remarkable in their simplicity to characterize Γ-isometries.

Lemma 2.17. *A pair of bounded operators* (S,P) *defined on* $\mathcal{H}$ *is a pure* Γ*-isometry if and only if* $S=C+C^*P$ *for some pure isometry* P *and a bounded operator* C *which commutes with* P *and* P^* *and has numerical radius not greater than* 1.

Proof. Let (S,P) be a pure Γ-isometry. Then by Theorem 2.4 of [6], S and P can be identified with M_φ^E and M_z^E respectively on $H^2(E)$ for some separable Hilbert space E, where $\varphi(z)=G+G^*z$ for an operator G defined on E such that $\omega(G)\le 1$. Clearly

$$M_\varphi^E=M_{G+G^*z}^E=M_G^E+M_{G^*}^EM_z^E\equiv(I\otimes G)+(I\otimes G^*)(M_z\otimes I)\text{ on }H^2(\mathbb{D})\otimes E\equiv H^2(E).$$

Therefore $S\equiv C+C^*P$ where $P=M_z\otimes I$ and $C=I\otimes G$. Obviously P commutes with C,C^* and $\omega(C)\le 1$.
Conversely, let $S=C+C^*P$ where $\omega(C)\le 1$ and P is a pure isometry which commutes with C and C^*. Since P is a pure isometry, $P\equiv M_z^E$ on $H^2(E)$ and hence $C\equiv M_\varphi^E$ on $H^2(E)$ for some $\varphi\in\mathcal{H}^\infty(\mathcal{B}(E))$, by the commutativity of C and P.
Also since both of M_φ^E and M_φ^{E*} commute with M_z^E, the function φ is a constant say equal to G_1. Clearly

$$M_\varphi^E\equiv(I\otimes G_1)\text{ and }M_z^E\equiv M_z\otimes I\text{ on }H^2(\mathbb{D})\otimes E.$$

By the commutativity of C and P we have

$$S^*P=(C^*+P^*C)P=S.$$

Now

$$\omega(S)=\omega(C+C^*P)\le\omega(C)+\omega(C^*P)=\omega(I\otimes G_1)+\omega(M_z\otimes G_1^*)\le 1+\omega(M_z\otimes G_1^*).$$

Since $\omega(G_1^*)\le 1$, by Ando's result (Theorem 2.10) there exists a contraction T such that

$$G_1^*=2(I-T^*T)^{1/2}T.$$

Considering the contraction $T_1=M_z\otimes T$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}2(I-T_1^*T_1)^{1/2}T_1&=2(I\otimes I-(M_z^*\otimes T^*)(M_z\otimes T))^{1/2}(M_z\otimes T)\\&=2(I\otimes I-I\otimes T^*T)^{1/2}(M_z\otimes T)\\&=2I\otimes(I-T^*T)^{1/2}(M_z\otimes T)\\&=M_z\otimes\{2(I-T^*T)^{1/2}T\}\\&=M_z\otimes G_1^*.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by Ando's result again, $\omega(M_z \otimes G_1^*) \leq 1$. Thus we have $\omega(S) \leq 2$. Therefore by Theorem 2.14-(3), (S,P) is a Γ-isometry where P is a pure isometry i.e, (S,P) is a pure Γ-isometry.

□

Theorem 2.18. *A pair of bounded operators (S,P) defined on $\mathscr{H}$ is a Γ-isometry if and only if $S = C + C^*P$ for some isometry P and a bounded operator C which commutes with P and P^* and has numerical radius not greater than* 1.

Proof. By Theorem 2.14, (S,P) is a Γ-isometry if and only if $S = S_1 \oplus S_2$ and $P = P_1 \oplus P_2$ where (S_1, P_1) and (S_2, P_2) are Γ-unitary and pure Γ-isometry respectively.

Therefore $S_2 = C + C^*P_2$ where $\omega(C) \leq 1$ and P_2 is a pure isometry which commutes with C and C^*. Also by Theorem 2.5, $S_1 = U + U^*P_1$ where U is a unitary which commutes with P_1. Choosing $C_1 = U \oplus C$ we get

$$S = S_1 \oplus S_2 = C_1 + C_1^*(P_1 \oplus P_2) = C_1 + C_1^*P,$$

where P commutes with C_1, C_1^* and obviously $\omega(C_1) \leq 1$. □

Observation 2.19. *Let (S,P) be a Γ-contraction where P is a projection. Then S and P have the operator matrices*

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & 0 \\ 0 & S_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad P = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

with respect to the decomposition $\mathscr{H} = Ran(P) \oplus Ker(P)$.

Proof. Clearly P has the stated form as P is a projection. Let $S = [S_{ij}]_{i,j=1}^2$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathscr{H} = Ran(P) \oplus Ker(P)$. By the commutativity of S and P it follows that $S_{12} = S_{21} = 0$. □

Observation 2.20. *If (S,P) is a Γ-contraction where P is a partial isometry then $S - S^*P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ * & S \end{pmatrix}$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathscr{H} = \overline{Ran P^*} \oplus Ker(P)$.*

Proof. Since (S,P) is a Γ-contraction by Proposition 2.3, $\rho(\alpha S, \alpha^2 P) \geq 0$ for all α in $\mathbb{T}$ which implies that

$$(I - P^*P) - \text{Re}\,\alpha(S - S^*P) \geq 0.$$

Since P is a partial isometry, P^*P is a projection onto $\overline{Ran P^*} = Ker(P)^{\perp}$. Therefore $I - P^*P$ is a projection onto $Ker(P)$. So we have $P_{Ker(P)} - \text{Re}\,\alpha(S - S^*P) \geq 0$ for all α in $\mathbb{T}$. Therefore for $x \in Ker(P)^{\perp} = \overline{Ran P^*}$ we have $P_{Ker(P)}(x) = 0$ and hence

$$\text{Re}\,\alpha(S - S^*P)|_{\overline{Ran P^*}} \leq 0, \text{ for all } \alpha \text{ in } \mathbb{T}.$$

Therefore by Lemma 2.4, $(S - S^*P)|_{\overline{Ran P^*}} = 0$. Hence $\overline{Ran}(S - S^*P) \subseteq Ker(P)$ and $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ * & S \end{pmatrix}$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathscr{H} = \overline{Ran P^*} \oplus Ker(P)$. □

A canonical way of constructing a Γ-isometry is to consider the Hardy space $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ of the bidisc with the reproducing kernel $\frac{1}{(1-z_1\overline{w}_1)(1-z_2\overline{w}_2)}$. If M_{z_1} and M_{z_2} are multiplications by the independent variables z_1 and z_2 respectively, then $(M_{z_1} + M_{z_2}, M_{z_1}M_{z_2})$ is a Γ-isometry.

3. Γ-CONTRACTIONS - EXAMPLES

Dilating a contraction operator to an isometry is well studied in the history of dilation theory (see [20]). For the class of examples of Γ-contractions contained in this section, we produce their Γ-isometric dilations.

Definition 3.1. *Let (S,P) be a Γ-contraction on $\mathcal{H}$. A commuting pair of operators (T,V) acting on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{N}$ containing $\mathcal{H}$ as a subspace is said to be a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P) if (T,V) is a Γ-isometry and*

$$T^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = S^* \text{ and } V^*|_{\mathcal{H}} = P^*.$$

Thus (T,V) is a Γ-isometric dilation of a Γ-contraction (S,P) is same as saying that (T^*,V^*) is a Γ-co-isometric extension of (S^*,P^*). Moreover, the dilation will be called minimal if

$$\mathcal{N} = \overline{\text{span}}\{V^n h : h \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } n = 0,1,2,\dots\}.$$

We shall see the existence and uniqueness of minimal Γ-isometric dilation in Theorem 4.3. In this section we exhibit a new class of examples of Γ-contractions and using a recent theorem of Douglas, Misra and Sarkar ([11]), find Γ-isometric dilations of some of them. The main result of this section is Theorem 3.8.

Lemma 3.2. *Let T_1 and T_2 be to commuting contractions defined on $\mathcal{H}$ and let $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ be a subspace invariant under T_1+T_2 and T_1T_2. Then $((T_1+T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}}, T_1T_2|_{\mathcal{M}})$ is a Γ-contraction.*

Proof. We have to show that Γ is a spectral set for $((T_1+T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}}, T_1T_2|_{\mathcal{M}})$, that is, for any polynomial p of two variables,

$$\|p((T_1+T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}}, T_1T_2|_{\mathcal{M}})\| \le \|p(z_1,z_2)\|_{\infty,\Gamma}.$$

Let $\pi : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2$ be defined as

$$\pi(z_1,z_2) = (z_1+z_2, z_1z_2).$$

Then by *von Neumann's* inequality in the bidisc $\mathbb{D}^2$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|p(\pi(T_1,T_2))\| \le \|p\circ\pi\|_{\infty,\mathbb{D}^2} \\ \text{or } &\|p(T_1+T_2, T_1T_2)\| \le \|p\|_{\infty,\Gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Certainly,

$$\|p((T_1+T_2)|_{\mathcal{M}}, T_1T_2|_{\mathcal{M}})\| \le \|p(T_1+T_2, T_1T_2)\|.$$

Hence done. □

Let us see a particular example of this theorem. For $\lambda,\mu > 1$ we define the weighted Bergman spaces

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2) = \{f : \mathbb{D}^2 \to \mathbb{C} : f \text{ is holomorphic and} \\ \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} |f(z_1,z_2)|^2(1-|z_1|^2)^{\lambda-2}(1-|z_2|^2)^{\mu-2} dm^{(\lambda,\mu)}(z_1,z_2) < \infty\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $m^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ is $\frac{(\lambda-1)(\mu-1)}{\pi^2}$ times the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{D}^2$. It is easy to verify that $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is a Hilbert space. For $f,g \in \mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, define

$$\langle f,g\rangle_{\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)} = \int_{\mathbb{D}^2} f(z_1,z_2)\overline{g(z_1,z_2)}(1-|z_1|^2)^{\lambda-2}(1-|z_2|^2)^{\mu-2} dm^{(\lambda,\mu)}(z_1,z_2).$$

Let Γ^0 denote the interior of Γ. Define the Hilbert space

$$\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma^0)=\{f:\Gamma^0\to\mathbb{C}: f \text{ is holomorphic and } (f\circ\pi)\det J_\pi\in\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)\}, \tag{3.2}$$

with

$$\langle f,g\rangle_{\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma^0)}=\langle (f\circ\pi)\det J_\pi,(g\circ\pi)\det J_\pi\rangle_{\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)},$$

where $J_\pi=\begin{pmatrix}1 & 1\\ z_2 & z_1\end{pmatrix}$ is the Jacobian of the map $\pi(z_1,z_2)=(z_1+z_2,z_1z_2)$ so that $\det J_\pi=(z_1-z_2)$. Let $M_s^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ and $M_p^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ be the multiplication operators on $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma^0)$ by the co-ordinate functions s and p, respectively, where $(s,p)\in\Gamma^0$. For $\lambda=\mu$, we denote $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ by $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\lambda)}(\Gamma^0)$ by $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\Gamma^0)$, $M_s^{(\lambda,\lambda)}$ by $M_s^{(\lambda)}$ and $M_p^{(\lambda,\lambda)}$ by $M_p^{(\lambda)}$. The following lemma serves the purpose of showing that the operator pair $(M_s^{(\lambda,\mu)},M_p^{(\lambda,\mu)})$, which is obviously a commuting pair, is a Γ-contraction.

Lemma 3.3. *For integers $m,n\geq 0$, let $\widetilde{e_{mn}}$ and $\widetilde{f_{mn}}$ be the functions defined on $\mathbb{D}^2$ by*

$$\widetilde{e_{mn}}(z_1,z_2)=z_1^m z_2^n-z_1^n z_2^m \quad\text{and}\quad \widetilde{f_{mn}}(z_1,z_2)=z_1^m z_2^n+z_1^n z_2^m.$$

Let $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2):=\overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\widetilde{e_{mn}}:m>n\geq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2):=\overline{\operatorname{span}}\{\widetilde{f_{mn}}:m\geq n\geq 0\}$ be subspaces of $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Then

1. *both $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ are invariant subspaces of $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ under $M_{z_1+z_2}$ and $M_{z_1z_2}$;*
2. *the restrictions of the pair $(M_{z_1+z_2},M_{z_1z_2})$ to the invariant subspaces $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ are Γ-contractions, call them $(S_a^{(\lambda,\mu)},P_a^{(\lambda,\mu)})$ and $(S_s^{(\lambda,\mu)}P_s^{(\lambda,\mu)})$ respectively. As usual, for $\lambda=\mu$ we use just one index.*
3. *there is an isometry U from $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma^0)$ onto $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ such that $UM_s^{(\lambda,\mu)}U^*=S_a^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ and $UM_p^{(\lambda,\mu)}U^*=P_a^{(\lambda,\mu)}$.*

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}(z_1+z_2)(z_1^m z_2^n-z_1^n z_2^m)&=z_1^{m+1}z_2^n-z_1^{n+1}z_2^m+z_1^m z_2^{n+1}-z_1^n z_2^{m+1}\\&=(z_1^{m+1}z_2^n-z_1^n z_2^{m+1})+(z_1^m z_2^{n+1}-z_1^{n+1}z_2^m)\end{aligned}$$

Again

$$z_1z_2(z_1^m z_2^n-z_1^n z_2^m)=(z_1^{m+1}z_2^{n+1}-z_1^{n+1}z_2^{m+1}).$$

So $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is invariant under both of the multiplication operators $M_{z_1+z_2}$ and $M_{z_1z_2}$. We can show similarly that $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is invariant under both the operators $M_{z_1+z_2}$ and $M_{z_1z_2}$. Hence by Lemma 3.2, (1) and (2) above are proved. To prove (3), define

$$U:\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\Gamma^0)\longrightarrow\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$$

by

$$Uf=(f\circ\pi)\det J_\pi.$$

That U is an isometry follows from the definitions of norms on the corresponding spaces. It is easy to check by direct computation that U intertwines $M_s^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ with $S_a^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ and $M_p^{(\lambda,\mu)}$ with $P_a^{(\lambda,\mu)}$. ☐

Remark 3.4. We observe that $\langle \widetilde{e_{mn}}, \widetilde{f_{mn}} \rangle_{\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)} = \frac{m!n!}{(\lambda)_m(\mu)_n} - \frac{m!n!}{(\mu)_m(\lambda)_n}$, for $m > n \geq 0$, where $(\lambda)_m = \frac{\lambda(\lambda-1)(\lambda-2)\ldots(\lambda-m+1)}{m!}$. Therefore the subspaces $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ of $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda,\mu)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ are mutually orthogonal if and only if $\lambda = \mu$.

Consider the weighted Bergman space $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, as defined in (3.1), on the bidisc for $\lambda > 1$ and its subspaces

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2) := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{z_1^m z_2^n - z_1^n z_2^m : m > n \geq 0, (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2\}$$

and

$$\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2) := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{z_1^m z_2^n + z_1^n z_2^m : m \geq n \geq 0, (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2\}.$$

They are mutually orthogonal and $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2) = \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2) \oplus \mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Let

$$f_{mn}(z_1, z_2) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda)_m(\lambda)_n}{2(m!n!)}}(z_1^m z_2^n + z_1^n z_2^m) & \text{for } m > n \geq 0; \\ \sqrt{\frac{(\lambda)_n}{n!}}(z_1 z_2)^n & \text{for } m = n \geq 0. \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

Clearly, $\{f_{mn}\}_{m \geq n \geq 0}$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$.

Proposition 3.5. *The Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with its reproducing kernel $K_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}$ given by the formula:*

$$K_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w}) = \frac{1}{2}(1 - z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-\lambda}(1 - z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-\lambda} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-\lambda}(1 - z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-\lambda}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_1, z_2)$ and $\boldsymbol{w} = (w_1, w_2)$ are in $\mathbb{D}^2$

Proof. We shall prove this by expanding the right hand side of the formula (3.4) in terms of the basis elements f_{mn}. For $\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{D}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} K_{\mathrm{s}}^{(\lambda)}(\boldsymbol{z}, \boldsymbol{w}) &= \sum_{m \geq n \geq 0} f_{mn}(z_1, z_2)\overline{f_{mn}(w_1, w_2)} \\ &= \sum_{m > n \geq 0} f_{mn}(z_1, z_2)\overline{f_{mn}(w_1, w_2)} + \sum_{n \geq 0} f_{nn}(z_1, z_2)\overline{f_{nn}(w_1, w_2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\substack{m,n \geq 0 \\ m \neq n}} f_{mn}(z_1, z_2)\overline{f_{mn}(w_1, w_2)} + \sum_{n \geq 0} f_{nn}(z_1, z_2)\overline{f_{nn}(w_1, w_2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{4}\sum_{\substack{m,n \geq 0 \\ m \neq n}} \frac{(\lambda)_m(\lambda)_n}{m!n!}\Big((z_1\bar{w}_1)^m(z_2\bar{w}_2)^n + (z_1\bar{w}_2)^m(z_2\bar{w}_1)^n + (z_2\bar{w}_1)^m(z_1\bar{w}_2)^n \\ &\qquad + (z_2\bar{w}_2)^m(z_1\bar{w}_1)^n\Big) + \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(\lambda)_n^2}{(n!)^2}(z_1\bar{w}_1)^n(z_2\bar{w}_2)^n \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 - z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-\lambda}(1 - z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-\lambda} + \frac{1}{2}(1 - z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-\lambda}(1 - z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

□

Edigarian and Zwonek found the Bergman kernel for symmetrized polydisc, see [15]. We shall need explicit formulae for the reproducing kernels of the weighted Bergman spaces $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\Gamma^0)$, as defined in (3.2). These have been extensively studied in [19]. We recall only some relevant facts here. For $\lambda > 1$, the reproducing kernel for the weighted Bergman space $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\Gamma^0)$ on the interior of the symmetrized bidisc Γ^0 is given by

$$\mathbf{B}^{(\lambda)}_{\Gamma^0}(\pi(\boldsymbol{z}),\pi(\boldsymbol{w})) = \frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{\{(1-z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-\lambda}(1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-\lambda}-(1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-\lambda}(1-z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-\lambda}\}}{(z_1-z_2)(\bar{w}_1-\bar{w}_2)}, \quad \boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{D}^2. \tag{3.5}$$

The kernel above remains a positive definite kernel for $\lambda = 1$. This prompted the authors of [19] to define the Hardy space $H^2(\Gamma^0)$ of the symmetrized bidisc to be the reproducing kernel Hilbert space whose kernel is

$$\mathbb{S}_{\Gamma^0}(\pi(\boldsymbol{z}),\pi(\boldsymbol{w})) = \frac{(1-z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-1}(1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-1}-(1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-1}(1-z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-1}}{(z_1-z_2)(\bar{w}_1-\bar{w}_2)}, \quad \boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{D}^2. \tag{3.6}$$

Lemma 3.6. *The ratio* $\mathbb{S}^{-1}_{\Gamma^0}\mathbf{B}^{(n)}_{\Gamma^0}$ *of the reproducing kernel of the weighted Bergman space* $\mathbb{A}^{(n)}(\Gamma^0)$ *with the reproducing kernel of the Hardy space* $H^2(\Gamma^0)$ *is a positive definite kernel for all positive integers* n.

Proof. For $\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{w}\in\mathbb{D}^2$, from (3.5) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{S}^{-1}_{\Gamma^0}\mathbf{B}^{(n)}_{\Gamma^0}(\pi(\boldsymbol{z}),\pi(\boldsymbol{w})) &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\frac{(1-z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-n}(1-z_2\bar{w}_2)^{-n}-(1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-n}(1-z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-n}}{(1-z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-1}(1-z_2\bar{w}_2)^{-1}-(1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-1}(1-z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-1}}\\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}a^{n-1-k}b^k,\end{aligned}$$

where $a = (1-z_1\bar{w}_1)^{-1}(1-z_2\bar{w}_2)^{-1}$ and $b = (1-z_1\bar{w}_2)^{-1}(1-z_2\bar{w}_1)^{-1}$. Clearly, the last expression can be expressed as a polynomial in ab and $a^k + b^k$ for $k = 1,\dots,n-1$. Since $ab = \mathbb{S}_{\Gamma^0}(\pi(\boldsymbol{z}),\pi(\boldsymbol{w}))$ is the reproducing kernel for the Hilbert spaces $H^2(\Gamma^0)$ and $a^k + b^k = K^{(k)}_{\mathrm{s}}(\boldsymbol{z},\boldsymbol{w})$ is the reproducing kernel for the Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}^{(k)}_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathbb{D}^2)$, they both are positive definite. Recalling that pointwise product and sum of two positive definite kernels are again positive definite kernels we conclude that $\mathbb{S}^{-1}_{\Gamma^0}\mathbf{B}^{(n)}_{\Gamma^0}$ is a positive definite kernel. □

By $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$, we shall denote the Hardy space of the bidisc. For convenience of notation, we shall also call it $\mathbb{A}^{(1)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. This will enable us to talk about the operator pairs $(S^{(1)}_a, P^{(1)}_a)$ and $(S^{(1)}_s, P^{(1)}_s)$.

Lemma 3.7. *The pair* (M^H_s, M^H_p) *of multiplication operators on* $H^2(\Gamma^0)$ *by the co-ordinate functions is a* Γ*-isometry.*

Proof. Let $H^2_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbb{D}^2) := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{z_1^m z_2^n - z_1^n z_2^m : m \ge n \ge 0, (z_1,z_2)\in\mathbb{D}^2\}$ and $H^2_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathbb{D}^2) := \overline{\operatorname{span}}\{z_1^m z_2^n + z_1^n z_2^m : m \ge n \ge 0, (z_1,z_2)\in\mathbb{D}^2\}$. Clearly, $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2) = H^2_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbb{D}^2) \oplus H^2_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. For $\lambda = \mu = 1$, analogous arguments as in Lemma 3.3, shows that

(i) the subspaces $H^2_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ and $H^2_{\mathrm{s}}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ are invariant subspaces of $H^2(\mathbb{D}^2)$ under $M_{z_1+z_2}$ and $M_{z_1z_2}$;
(ii) there is an isometry U from $H^2(\Gamma^0)$ onto $H^2_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ such that $UM^H_sU^* = S^{(1)}_a$ and $UM^H_pU^* = P^{(1)}_a$.

By Theorem 2.5–(2), the pair $(M_{z_1+z_2}, M_{z_1z_2})$ is a Γ-unitary on $L^2(\mathbb{T}^2)$. Moreover, $S^{(1)}_a = M_{z_1+z_2}|_{H^2_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbb{D}^2)}$ and $P^{(1)}_a = M_{z_1z_2}|_{H^2_{\mathrm{a}}(\mathbb{D}^2)}$. So $(S^{(1)}_a, P^{(1)}_a)$ is a Γ-isometry. Noting that U is a unitary, it follows from (ii) that (M^H_s, M^H_p) is a Γ-isometry. □

Recall that $(M_s^{(\lambda)}, M_p^{(\lambda)})$ denotes the commuting pair of multiplication operators by the coordinate functions s and p, respectively, on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}^{(\lambda)}(\Gamma^0)$ for $\lambda > 1$. For $\lambda = 1$, this space is the Hardy space $H^2(\Gamma^0)$ and the operator pair is (M_s^H, M_p^H). Thus, by Lemma 3.6 and Theorem 6 of [11], we have proved the following theorem which is the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.8. *For every positive integer n, the Γ-contraction $(M_s^{(n)}, M_p^{(n)})$acting on $\mathbb{A}^{(n)}(\Gamma^0)$ can be dilated to the Γ-isometry $(M_s^H \otimes I_{\mathscr{L}}, M_p^H \otimes I_{\mathscr{L}})$ on $H^2(\Gamma^0) \otimes \mathscr{L}$ for some Hilbert space $\mathscr{L}$.*

Recalling the notations from Lemma 3.3, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.9. *For every positive integer n, the commuting pair of operators $(S_a^{(n)}, P_a^{(n)})$ acting on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}_{\rm a}^{(n)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ has a Γ-isometric dilation to the commuting pair of operators $(S_a^{(1)}, P_a^{(1)})$ on the Hilbert space $H^2_{\rm a}(\mathbb{D}^2) \otimes \mathscr{L}$ for some Hilbert space $\mathscr{L}$.*

Proof. Observing that the isometry U in part 3 of Lemma 3.3 is actually a unitary the proof follows from Theorem 3.8. ☐

Lemma 3.10. *The Γ-isometric dilation $(S_a^{(1)}, P_a^{(1)})$ on the Hilbert space $H^2_{\rm a}(\mathbb{D}^2) \otimes \mathscr{L}$ of the commuting pair of operators $(S_a^{(n)}, P_a^{(n)})$ on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}_{\rm a}^{(n)}(\mathbb{D}^2)$ is minimal.*

Proof. To prove minimality, we need to show that $\overline{\text{span}}\{P_1^k h : h \in H^2_{\rm a}(\mathbb{D}^2), k \geq 0\} = H^2_{\rm a}(\mathbb{D}^2)$. Recalling that $\widetilde{e_{mn}}(z_1, z_2) = z_1^m z_2^n - z_1^n z_2^m$ and $H^2_{\rm a}(\mathbb{D}^2) = \overline{\text{span}}\{\widetilde{e_{mn}} : m > n \geq 0\}$, it suffices to show that $\overline{\text{span}}\{P_1^k(\widetilde{e_{mn}}) : m > n \geq 0, k \geq 0\} = \overline{\text{span}}\{\widetilde{e_{mn}} : m > n \geq 0\}$. Since $P_1^k(\widetilde{e_{mn}}) = \widetilde{e_{m+k,n+k}}$, we have $\overline{\text{span}}\{P_1^k(\widetilde{e_{mn}}) : m > n \geq 0, k \geq 0\} = \overline{\text{span}}\{\widetilde{e_{m+k,n+k}} : m > n \geq 0, k \geq 0\} = \overline{\text{span}}\{\widetilde{e_{mn}} : m > n \geq 0\}$. Hence the proof is complete. ☐

We have a corollary of the above lemma.

Corollary 3.11. *The dilation $(M_s^H \otimes I_{\mathscr{L}}, M_p^H \otimes I_{\mathscr{L}})$ on the Hilbert space $H^2(\Gamma^0) \otimes \mathscr{L}$ of the commuting pair of operators $(M_s^{(n)}, M_p^{(n)})$ on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{A}^{(n)}(\Gamma^0)$ is minimal.*

Proof. Set $\epsilon_{mn}(s,p) = \epsilon \circ \pi(z_1, z_2) = \frac{z_1^m z_2^n - z_1^n z_2^m}{z_1 - z_2}$ for $(s,p) \in \Gamma^0, (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{D}^2$. So $H^2(\Gamma^0) = \overline{\text{span}}\{\epsilon_{mn} : m > n \geq 0\}$ and $M_p \epsilon_{mn} = \epsilon_{m+1,n+1}$. Now analogous arguments as in the previous corollary shows that

$$\overline{\text{span}}\{M_p^k \epsilon_{mn} : m > n \geq 0, k \geq 0\} = \overline{\text{span}}\{\epsilon_{mn} : m > n \geq 0, \} = H^2(\Gamma^0).$$

This proves minimality of $(M_s^H \otimes I_{\mathscr{L}}, M_p^H \otimes I_{\mathscr{L}})$ on the Hilbert space $H^2(\Gamma^0) \otimes \mathscr{L}$. ☐

We move on to general discussion of dilation in the next section.

4. Dilation

As in many occasions in operator theory, in our case too, finding a solution to an operator equation turns out to be of utmost importance. As is clear by now, a crucial role in deciphering the structure of a Γ-contraction (S,P) is played by the operator $S - S^*P$. For a pair (S,P) of commuting bounded operators with $\|P\| \leq 1$, we shall denote from now on by Σ and Σ_*, the operators $S - S^*P$ and $S^* - SP^*$ respectively. We denote by $\mathbf{D}_P$ and $\mathscr{D}_P$ the operator $(I - P^*P)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and its range closure respectively. For a pair of commuting bounded operators (S,P) with $\|P\| \leq 1$, the *fundamental equation* is defined to be

$$\Sigma = \mathbf{D}_P X \mathbf{D}_P, \text{ where } X \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_P) \tag{4.1}$$

and the same for the pair (S^*, P^*) is

$$\Sigma_* = \mathbf{D}_{P^*} Y \mathbf{D}_{P^*}, \text{ where } Y \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_{P^*}). \tag{4.2}$$

We start with a pivotal theorem which guarantees the existence and uniqueness of solutions of such equations for Γ-contractions. The proof of the theorem needs the following lemma and the proof of the lemma given here is from a private communication with Michael A. Dritschel.

Lemma 4.1. *Let Σ and D be two bounded operators on $\mathscr{H}$. Then*

$$DD^* \geq \text{ Re}\,(e^{i\theta}\Sigma) \quad \textit{for all } \theta \in [0, 2\pi)$$

if and only if there is $F \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_*)$ with numerical radius of F not greater than one such that $\Sigma = DFD^*$, where $\mathscr{D}_* = \overline{\text{Ran}}\, D^*$.

The proof of this result needs the operator Fejer-Riesz factorization theorem (Theorem 2.1 of [14]) along with Douglas's lemma (Lemma 2.1 of [12]) and the familiar result that an operator X has numerical radius not greater than one if and only if Re $\beta X \leq I$ for all complex numbers β of modulus 1 (Lemma 2.9).

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Let there be an operator $F \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H})$ with numerical radius not bigger than one such that $\Sigma = DFD^*$. Since $I - \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}F) \geq 0$, for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, we have

$$D(I - \text{Re } e^{i\theta}F)D^* \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } \theta.$$

So we have

$$DD^* \geq D\text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}F)D^* = \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}\; DFD^*) = \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}\Sigma)$$

for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$.

The nontrivial part of this lemma, however, is the converse of the above. Suppose that $DD^* \geq \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}\Sigma)$ for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. This means that the Laurent polynomial

$$DD^* - \frac{1}{2}(z\Sigma + \bar{z}\Sigma^*)$$

is non-negative for z on the unit circle. By the operator Fejér-Riesz theorem (Theorem 2.1 of [14]) we thus have a factorization

$$DD^* - \frac{1}{2}(z\Sigma + \bar{z}\Sigma^*) = (X - zY)(X^* - \bar{z}Y^*), \quad |z| = 1,$$

with $X, Y \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{H})$. Thus $DD^* = XX^* + YY^*$ and $\Sigma = 2YX^*$. Since $DD^* \geq XX^*$ and $DD^* \geq YY^*$, Douglas's lemma tells us that there exist contractions Q and R such that $X = DQ$ and $Y = DR$. Thus $\Sigma = DFD^*$ for

$$F = P_{\mathscr{D}_*} 2RQ^*|_{\mathscr{D}_*}.$$

To show that the numerical radius of F is not greater than one, note that $DD^* \geq \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}\Sigma) = \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}DFD^*)$ for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ which implies that

$$D(I_{\mathscr{D}_*} - \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}F))D^* \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } \theta \in [0, 2\pi).$$

Hence

$$\langle (I_{\mathscr{D}_*} - \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}F))D^*h, D^*h\rangle = \langle D(I_{\mathscr{D}_*} - \text{Re}\,(e^{i\theta}F))D^*h, h\rangle \geq 0$$

for all $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$ and as a consequence, the numerical radius of A is no bigger than one. ☐

Now here is the theorem which guarantees the existence and uniqueness of solution to the fundamental equation of a Γ-contraction.

Theorem 4.2. *Let (S,P) be a Γ-contraction. Then there is a unique solution A to its fundamental equation*

$$S - S^*P = D_P X D_P.$$

Moreover, A has numerical radius less than or equal to one.

Proof. Since (S,P) is a Γ-contraction, by Proposition 2.3, we have

$$\rho(\alpha S, \alpha^2 P) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}.$$

So in particular for all β with modulus 1, we have $D_P^2 - \operatorname{Re} \beta(S - S^*P) \geq 0$. Therefore by Lemma 4.1, there exists an operator $A \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_P)$ with numerical radius not greater than one such that $S - S^*P = D_P A D_P$.
For uniqueness let there be two such solutions A_1 and A_2. Then

$$D_P \tilde{A} D_P = 0, \quad \text{where } \tilde{A} = A_1 - A_2 \in \mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_P).$$

Then

$$\langle \tilde{A} D_P h, D_P h' \rangle = \langle D_P \tilde{A} D_P h, h' \rangle = 0$$

which shows that $\tilde{A} = 0$ and hence $A_1 = A_2$. □

This theorem allows us to construct an explicit Γ-isometric dilation of a Γ-contraction, which is one of our main results and is shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Let (S,P) be a Γ-contraction on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$. Let A be the unique solution of the fundamental equation (4.1) and let $\mathscr{K}_0 = \mathscr{H} \oplus \mathscr{D}_p \oplus \mathscr{D}_p \oplus \mathscr{D}_p \oplus \cdots = \mathscr{H} \oplus l^2(\mathscr{D}_p)$. Consider the operators T_A, V_0 defined on $\mathscr{K}_0$ by*

$$T_A(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) = (Sh_0, A^*\mathbf{D}_P h_0 + Ah_1, A^*h_1 + Ah_2, A^*h_2 + Ah_3, \dots)$$
$$V_0(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) = (Ph_0, \mathbf{D}_P h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots).$$

Then

1. *(1) (T_A, V_0) is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P).*
2. *(2) If $(\widehat{T}, V_0)$ on $\mathscr{K}_0$ is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P), then $\widehat{T} = T_A$.*
3. *(3) If (T,V) is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P) where V is a minimal isometric dilation of P, then (T,V) is unitarily equivalent to (T_A, V_0).*

Thus (2) *and* (3) *guarantee the uniqueness of Γ-isometric dilation (T,V) of (S,P) where V is minimal isometric dilation of P.*

Proof. **(1)** It is evident from the definition that V_0 on $\mathscr{K}_0$ is the minimal isometric dilation of P. Obviously T_A^* and V_0^* are defined on $\mathscr{K}_0$ as

$$T_A^*(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) = (S^*h_0 + \mathbf{D}_P A h_1, A^*h_1 + Ah_2, A^*h_2 + Ah_3, \dots)$$
$$V_0^*(h_0, h_1, h_2, \dots) = (P^*h_0 + \mathbf{D}_P h_1, h_2, h_3, \dots).$$

The space $\mathscr{H}$ can be embedded inside $\mathscr{K}_0$ by the map $h \mapsto (h, 0, 0, \dots)$. It is clear that $\mathscr{H}$, considered as a subspace of $\mathscr{K}_0$ is co-invariant under T_A and V_0 and $T_A^*|_{\mathscr{H}} = S^*$, $V_0^*|_{\mathscr{H}} = P^*$. Since V_0 is an isometry, in order to show that (T_A, V_0) is a Γ-*isometric dilation* of (S,P) one has to justify (by virtue of Theorem 2.14-(3)) the following:

- (a) $T_A V_0 = V_0 T_A$
- (b) $T_A = T_A^* V_0$
- (c) $r(T_A) \leq 2$.

$$\begin{aligned}T_A V_0(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots) &= T_A(Ph_0,\mathbf{D}_P h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)\\ &= (SPh_0, A^*\mathbf{D}_P h_0 + A\mathbf{D}_P h_0, A^*\mathbf{D}_P h_0 + Ah_1, A^*h_1 + Ah_2, A^*h_2 + Ah_3,\dots).\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}V_0 T_A(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots) &= V_0(Sh_0, A^*\mathbf{D}_P h_0 + Ah_1, A^*h_1 + Ah_2, A^*h_2 + Ah_3,\dots)\\ &= (PSh_0, \mathbf{D}_P Sh_0, A^*\mathbf{D}_P h_0 + Ah_1, A^*h_1 + Ah_2, A^*h_2 + Ah_3,\dots).\end{aligned}$$

Let $G = A^*\mathbf{D}_P P + A\mathbf{D}_p - \mathbf{D}_p S$. Then G is defined from $\mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{D}_P$. Since A is a solution of the equation (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{D}_P G &= \mathbf{D}_P A^*\mathbf{D}_P P + \mathbf{D}_P A\mathbf{D}_P - {\mathbf{D}_P}^2 S\\ &= (S^* - P^*S)P + (S - S^*P) - (I - P^*P)S = 0.\end{aligned}$$

Now $\langle Gh, \mathbf{D}_P h'\rangle = \langle \mathbf{D}_P Gh, h'\rangle = 0$ for all $h, h' \in \mathcal{H}$. This shows that $G = 0$ and hence $A^*\mathbf{D}_P P + A\mathbf{D}_P = \mathbf{D}_P S$. Therefore $T_A V_0 = V_0 T_A$.
Now

$$\begin{aligned}T_A^* V_0(h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots) &= T_A^*(Ph_0,\mathbf{D}_P h_0,h_1,h_2,\dots)\\ &= (S^*Ph_0 + \mathbf{D}_P A\mathbf{D}_P h_0, A^*\mathbf{D}_P h_0 + Ah_1, A^*h_1 + Ah_2, A^*h_2 + Ah_3,\dots).\end{aligned}$$

Since A is a solution of (4.1), we have $S^*P + \mathbf{D}_p A\mathbf{D}_p = S$. Therefore we have $T_A^* V_0 = T_A$.
We now show that $r(T_A) \le 2$ which completes the proof. The numerical radius of A is not greater than 1 by Theorem 4.2.
It is clear from the definition that T_A has the matrix form

$$T_A = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ A^*\mathbf{D}_p & A & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & A^* & A & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & 0 & A^* & A & \dots\\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix},$$

with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{D}_p \oplus \mathcal{D}_p \oplus \mathcal{D}_p \oplus \dots$ of $\mathcal{K}_0$. Again since $T_A = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0\\ C & D\end{pmatrix}$ on $\mathcal{H} \oplus l^2(\mathcal{D}_P) = \mathcal{K}_0$, where $C = \begin{pmatrix} A^*\mathbf{D}_P\\ 0\\ 0\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix}$ and $D = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ A^* & A & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & A^* & A & \dots\\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots\end{pmatrix}$, we have by Lemma 1 of [18] that $\sigma(T_A) \subseteq \sigma(S) \cup \sigma(D)$. We shall be done if we show that $r(S)$ and $r(D)$ are not greater than 2. We show that $\|D\| \le 2$. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi : \mathbb{D} &\to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{D}_P)\\ z &\to A + A^*z.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly φ is holomorphic, bounded and continuous on the boundary $\partial\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{T}$ of the disc. For $z = e^{-2i\theta} \in \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A + A^* z\| &= \|A + e^{-2i\theta} A^*\| \\
&= \|e^{i\theta} A + e^{-i\theta} A^*\| \\
&= \sup_{\|x\| \le 1} |\langle (e^{i\theta} A + e^{-i\theta} A^*)x, x\rangle| \quad [\text{since } e^{i\theta} A + e^{-i\theta} A^* \text{ is self adjoint}] \\
&\le \omega(A) + \omega(A^*) \\
&\le 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by *Maximum Modulus Principle*, $\|A + A^* z\| \le 2$ for all $z \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$ and $\|\varphi\| \le 2$. Let

$$\widehat{A}_n = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A^* & A & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & A^* & A & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & A^* & A \end{pmatrix}_{n \times n} \quad \text{on } \underbrace{\mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathscr{D}_P}_{n-times} = \mathbf{E}_n.$$

Let $f = \bigoplus_0^{n-1} f_i$ and $g = \bigoplus_0^{n-1} g_i$ be two arbitrary elements in $\mathbf{E}_n$. Let us consider the polynomials $p(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z^i f_i$ and $q(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} z^i g_i$ with values in $\mathscr{D}_P$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \widehat{A}_n f, g\rangle_{\mathbf{E}_n}| = |\langle \widehat{A}_n (\bigoplus_0^{n-1} f_i), (\bigoplus_0^{n-1} g_i)\rangle_{\mathbf{E}_n}| &= |\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \langle \phi(e^{it}) p(e^{it}), q(e^{it})\rangle_{\mathscr{D}_P} \, dt| \\
&\le \|\phi(e^{it}) p(e^{it})\|_{L^2} \|q(e^{it})\|_{L^2} \\
&\le 2\|p(e^{it})\|_{L^2} \|q(e^{it})\|_{L^2} \quad [\text{since } \|\phi\| \le 2] \\
&= 2\|\bigoplus_0^{n-1} f_i\|_{\mathbf{E}_n} \|\bigoplus_0^{n-1} g_i\|_{\mathbf{E}_n} \\
&= 2\|f\| \|g\|
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\|\widehat{A}_n\| \le 2$. Now we define D_n on $\mathbf{E}_n \oplus \mathbf{E}_\infty = l^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$, where $\mathbf{E}_\infty = l^2(\mathscr{D}_P) \ominus \mathbf{E}_n$, as $D_n = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{A}_n & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then $\|D_n\| = \|\widehat{A}_n\| \le 2$ and $D_n \to D$ strongly as $n \to \infty$. Hence $\|D\| \le 2$. Again since (S, P) is a Γ-contraction, $r(S) \le \|S\| \le 2$. Since both of $r(S), r(D)$ are not greater than 2, $r(T_A) \le 2$. Hence done.

(2) Obviously $V_0 = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ C_1 & D_1 \end{pmatrix}$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathscr{H} \oplus l^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$ of $\mathscr{K}_0$, where

$$C_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{D}_P \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix} \text{ from } \mathscr{H} \to \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \dots \text{ and } D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ I & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \dots.$$

Since $(\widehat{T}, V_0)$ on $\mathscr{K}_0$ is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P), we have $\widehat{T}^*|_{\mathscr{H}} = S^*$ and $V_0^*|_{\mathscr{H}} = P^*$. Therefore $\widehat{T}$ on $\mathscr{H} \oplus l^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$ has matrix form $\widehat{T} = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ E & F \end{pmatrix}$. Let us define

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 : & H^2(\mathscr{D}_P) \to \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \dots \\ & z^n \mapsto (\underbrace{0, 0, \dots, 0}_{n}, 1, 0, 0, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

The action of U_1 on an arbitrary vector is clear from its action on the basis $\{1, z, z^2, \dots\}$ of $H^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$. Since it maps a basis of $H^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$ to a basis of $\mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \mathscr{D}_P \oplus \dots$ in a one-to-one fashion, U_1 is a unitary operator. Therefore the spaces $\mathscr{K}_0$ and $\mathscr{H} \oplus H^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$ are isomorphic. Let $U = U_1^*$. Then $\widehat{T}$ and V_0 on $\mathscr{K}_0$ are respectively identified with the operators

$$\widetilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ UE & UFU^* \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \widetilde{V}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ UC_1 & UD_1U^* \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathscr{H} \oplus H^2(\mathscr{D}_P).$$

Therefore $(\widetilde{T}, \widetilde{V}_0)$ is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P). We now show that UD_1U^* is same as the multiplication operator $M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P}$ on $H^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$. For a basis vector z^n of $H^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} UD_1U^*(z^n) &= U \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ I & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & I & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & I & 0 & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad 1 \text{ at } (n+1)\text{th place} \\ &= U \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}, \quad 1 \text{ at } (n+2)\text{th place} \\ &= z^{n+1} = M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P}(z^n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $UD_1U^* = M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P}$. By the commutativity of $\widetilde{T}$ and $\widetilde{V}_0$ we have the commutativity of UFU^* and $UD_1U^*(= M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P})$. Therefore $UFU^* = M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P}$ for some $\varphi \in H^\infty(\mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_P))$. Thus

$$\widetilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ UE & M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \widetilde{V}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ UC_1 & M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P} \end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathscr{H} \oplus H^2(\mathscr{D}_P).$$

By $\widetilde{T} = \widetilde{T}^* \widetilde{V}_0$, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ UE & M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S^* & E^*U^* \\ 0 & M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P *} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ UC_1 & M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} S^*P + E^*C_1 & E^*U^*M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P} \\ M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P *} UC_1 & M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P *} M_z^{\mathscr{D}_P} \end{pmatrix},$$

which gives

$$\begin{cases} \text{(i) } S - S^*P = E^*C_1 \\ \text{(ii) } UE = M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P *} UC_1 \\ \text{(iii) } M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P} = M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P *} M_z. \end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

From (4.3)-(iii), it is clear by considering the power series expansion that $\varphi(z)=A_0+A_0^*z$, for some $A_0\in\mathscr{B}(\mathscr{D}_P)$. We now show that if $D_0=\begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ A_0^* & A_0 & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & A_0^* & A_0 & \dots\\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots\end{pmatrix}$ on $\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\dots$, then $UD_0U^*=M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P}$. For a basis vector z^n of $H^2(\mathscr{D}_P)$ we have

$$UD_0U^*(z^n)=U\begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ A_0^* & A_0 & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & A_0^* & A_0 & \dots\\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \vdots\\ 0\\ 1\\ 0\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix}=U\begin{pmatrix}0\\ \vdots\\ 0\\ A_0(1)\\ A_0^*(1)\\ 0\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix}=A_0(1)z^n+A_0^*(1)z^{n+1}=M_{A_0+A_0^*z}^{\mathscr{D}_P}(z^n)$$

Thus $UD_0U^*=M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P}$ and hence $F=D_0$. Combining this with (4.3)-(ii), we get $UE=M_\varphi^{\mathscr{D}_P*}UC_1=UD_0^*U^*UC_1=UD_0^*C_1$, i.e, $E=D_0^*C_1$. Therefore

$$\widehat{T}=\begin{pmatrix} S & 0\\ D_0^*C_1 & D_0\end{pmatrix} \text{ on } \mathscr{H}\oplus l^2(\mathscr{D}_P).$$

Considering the above stated matrix forms of D_0 and C_1 we get $D_0^*C_1=\begin{pmatrix}A_0^*\mathbf{D}_P\\ 0\\ 0\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix}$. Hence with respect to the decomposition $\mathscr{H}\oplus\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\dots$ of $\mathscr{K}_0$, we have

$$\widehat{T}=\begin{pmatrix} S & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ A_0^*\mathbf{D}_P & A_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & A_0^* & A_0 & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & 0 & A_0^* & A_0 & \dots\\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots\end{pmatrix}.$$

Also by (4.3)-(i),

$$\begin{aligned} S-S^*P=E^*C_1&=C_1^*D_0C_1\\ &=\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{D}_P & 0 & 0 & \dots\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} A_0 & 0 & 0 & \dots\\ A_0^* & A_0 & 0 & \dots\\ 0 & A_0^* & A_0 & \dots\\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{D}_P\\ 0\\ 0\\ \vdots\end{pmatrix}=\mathbf{D}_PA_0\mathbf{D}_P,\end{aligned}$$

which shows that A_0 satisfies the fundamental equation (4.1). By uniqueness of solution, $A=A_0$ and hence $\widehat{T}=T_A$.

(3) Let (T,V) defined on $\mathscr{K}$ be a minimal isometric dilation of (S,P), where V is a minimal isometric dilation of P. Since V on $\mathscr{K}$ is a minimal isometric dilation of P, there is a unitary

$$U:\mathscr{K}\to\mathscr{K}_0(=\mathscr{H}\oplus\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\mathscr{D}_P\oplus\dots)$$

such that $UVU^*=V_0$. Let $T^\flat=UTU^*$. Then $(T^\flat,V_0)$ on $\mathscr{K}_0$ is a Γ-isometry dilation of (S,P). Therefore by part-(2), $T^\flat=T_A$ and consequently (T,V) is unitarily equivalent to (T_A,V_0). ☐

As a consequence of the dilation theorem above, we have a new and elegant characterization for Γ-contractions.

Theorem 4.4. *Let (S,P) be a commuting pair of operators defined on $\mathscr{H}$. Then (S,P) is a Γ-contraction if and only if spectral radius of S is not greater than 2 and the fundamental equation $S-S^*P=\mathbf{D}_PX\mathbf{D}_P$ has a solution A with $\omega(A)\le 1$.*

Proof. Let there be a solution A to the fundamental equation $S-S^*P=\mathbf{D}_PX\mathbf{D}_P$ with $\omega(A)\le 1$ for such a pair (S,P). Then by the dilation theorem (Theorem 4.3), we can construct a Γ-isometry (T_A, V_0) of (S,P). Now clearly (S,P) can be recovered by compressing (T_A, V_0) to the common co-invariant subspace $\mathscr{H}$. So (S,P) is a Γ-contraction.
The converse is just the Theorem 4.2. □

Remark 4.5. We call the unique solution A of the operator equation (4.1) for a Γ-contraction (S,P), the fundamental operator of (S,P).

We now give another explicit construction of a Γ-isometric dilation of a pure Γ-contraction. This is very convenient to reap some beautiful consequences.

Theorem 4.6. *Let (S,P) be a Γ-contraction on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$ where P is in $C_{\cdot 0}$. Let B be the solution of the fundamental equation (4.2). Let us consider the operators T,V on $\mathscr{E}=H^2(\mathbb{D})\otimes\mathscr{D}_{P^*}$ defined as*

$$T=I\otimes B^*+M_z\otimes B \text{ and } V=M_z\otimes I.$$

Then (T,V) is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P).

Proof. Since B is the solution of the equation (4.2), by Theorem 4.2, the numerical radius of B is not greater than one. In order to prove that (T,V) is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P) we shall show the following steps:

1. the pair (T,V) is a Γ-*isometry* on $\mathscr{E}$.
2. The space $\mathscr{H}$ can be thought of as a subspace of $\mathscr{E}$, i.e, there is an isometric embedding of $\mathscr{H}$ in $\mathscr{E}$.
3. After identification of $\mathscr{H}$ with this isometric image, $V^*\mathscr{H}\subseteq\mathscr{H}$ and $V^*|_{\mathscr{H}}=P^*$. Also, $T^*\mathscr{H}\subseteq\mathscr{H}$ and $T^*|_{\mathscr{H}}=S^*$.

V is clearly an isometry (it is a shift of some multiplicity) and obviously it commutes with T. Also

$$T=(I\otimes B^*)+(I\otimes B)(M_z\otimes I)=C+C^*V,$$

where $C=I\otimes B^*$. Obviously C and C^* commute with V and $\omega(C)\le 1$. Therefore by Theorem 2.18, (T,V) is a Γ-isometry.

Now we embed $\mathscr{H}$ isometrically inside $H^2\otimes\mathscr{D}_{P^*}$ by defining $W:\mathscr{H}\to\mathscr{E}$ as $h\mapsto\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}z^n\otimes D_{P^*}P^{*n}h$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\|Wh\|^2 &= \|\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}z^n\otimes D_{P^*}P^{*n}h\|^2\\
&= \langle\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}z^n\otimes D_{P^*}P^{*n}h\,,\,\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}z^m\otimes D_{P^*}P^{*m}h\rangle\\
&= \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty}\langle z^n,z^m\rangle\langle D_{P^*}P^{*n}h\,,\,D_{P^*}P^{*m}h\rangle\\
&= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\langle P^nD_{P^*}^2P^{*n}h,h\rangle\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\langle P^n(I-PP^*)P^{*n}h,h\rangle\\
&= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}\{\langle P^nP^{*n}h,h\rangle-\langle P^{n+1}P^{*n+1}h,h\rangle\}\\
&= \|h\|^2-\lim_{n\to\infty}\|P^{*n}h\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $P\in C_{\cdot 0}$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}\|P^{*n}h\|^2=0$ and hence $\|Wh\|=\|h\|$. Therefore W is an isometry. Let $L=W^*$.

For a basis vector $z^n\otimes\xi$ of $\mathscr{E}$ we have

$$\langle L(z^n\otimes\xi),h\rangle=\langle z^n\otimes\xi,\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}z^k\otimes D_{P^*}P^{*k}h\rangle=\langle\xi,D_{P^*}P^{*n}h\rangle=\langle P^nD_{P^*}\xi,h\rangle.$$

This implies that

$$L(z^n\otimes\xi)=P^nD_{P^*}\xi,\quad for\ n=0,1,2,3,...$$

Therefore

$$\langle L(M_z\otimes I)(z^n\otimes\xi),h\rangle=\langle z^{n+1}\otimes\xi,\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}z^k\otimes D_{P^*}P^{*k}h\rangle=\langle\xi,D_{P^*}P^{*n+1}h\rangle=\langle P^{n+1}D_{P^*}\xi,h\rangle.$$

Consequently, $LV=PL$ on vectors of the form $z^n\otimes\xi$ which span $H^2\otimes\mathscr{D}_{P^*}$ and hence

$$LV=PL. \tag{4.4}$$

Therefore V^* leaves the range of L^* (isometric copy of $\mathscr{H}$) invariant and $V^*|_{L^*\mathscr{H}}=L^*P^*L$ which is the isometric copy of the operator P^* on range of L^*. For the next step,

$$\begin{aligned}
LT(z^n\otimes\xi)=L(I\otimes B^*+M_z\otimes B)(z^n\otimes\xi) &= L(I\otimes B^*)(z^n\otimes\xi)+L(M_z\otimes B)(z^n\otimes\xi)\\
&= L(z^n\otimes B^*\xi)+L(z^{n+1}\otimes B\xi)\\
&= P^nD_{P^*}B^*\xi+P^{n+1}D_{P^*}B\xi.
\end{aligned}$$

Again $SL(z^n\otimes\xi)=SP^nD_{P^*}\xi$. Therefore for showing $LT=SL$ it is enough to show that

$$P^nD_{P^*}B^*+P^{n+1}D_{P^*}B=SP^nD_{P^*}=P^nSD_{P^*}$$

$$\text{i.e, } D_{P^*}B^*+PD_{P^*}B=SD_{P^*}.$$

Let $H = D_{P^*}B^* + PD_{P^*}B - SD_{P^*}$. Then $H = 0$ by an argument similar to the one given in the proof of Theorem 4.3 to show that $G = 0$. So we have

$$D_{P^*}B^* + PD_{P^*}B = SD_{P^*}$$

and hence

$$L(I \otimes B^* + M_z \otimes B) = SL \tag{4.5}$$

which is similar to the equation (4.4). This shows that T^* leaves $L^*(\mathscr{H})$ invariant as well as $T^*|_{L^*(\mathscr{H})} = L^*S^*L$. Hence we are done. ☐

Remark 4.7. In particular when $\|P\| < 1$ the unique solutions A of (4.1) and B of (4.2) coincide with $\mathbf{D}_P^{-1}(S - S^*P)\mathbf{D}_P^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{D}_{P^*}^{-1}(S^* - SP^*)\mathbf{D}_{P^*}^{-1}$ respectively.

Corollary 4.8. *If (S,P) is a Γ-contraction with $P \in C_{\cdot 0}$, then $S = C + PC^*$ for some C with $\omega(C) \leq 1$.*

Proof. By the previous theorem, if (T,V) is a Γ-isometric dilation of (S,P) from (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&LT = L(I \otimes B^* + M_z \otimes B) = SL\\
&\text{or } L(I \otimes B^* + M_z \otimes B)L^* = S, \text{ since } L^* \text{ is isometry}\\
&\text{or } L(I \otimes B^*)L^* + L(M_z \otimes B)L^* = S\\
&\text{or } L(I \otimes B^*)L^* + L(M_z \otimes I)(I \otimes B)L^* = S\\
&\text{or } L(I \otimes B^*)L^* + PL(I \otimes B)L^* = S, \ \text{ since } L(M_z \otimes I) = PL.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $C = L(I \otimes B^*)L^*$ we get the stated form of S, and $\omega(C) \leq 1$ is obvious. ☐

Observation 4.9. *If (S,P) is a Γ-contraction with $P \in C_{\cdot 0}$, then S can also have the form $S = C_1 + C_1^*P$, where $\omega(C_1) \leq 1$.*

Proof. Clearly (S^*, P^*) is also a Γ-contraction and by the previous result, $S^* = C + P^*C^*$ for some C with $\omega(C) \leq 1$. This implies that $S = C^* + CP = C_1 + C_1^*P$ where $C_1 = C^*$. ☐

Observation 4.10. *If (S,P) is a Γ-contraction with $\|P\| < 1$, then there is a unique C such that $S = C + C^*P$.*

Proof. Let there be C_1 and C_2 such that $S = C_1 + C_1^*P$ and $S + C_2 + C_2^*P$. Then we have $C + C^*P = 0$, where $C = C_1 - C_2$. Now

$$\|C\| = \|-C^*P\| \leq \|C\|\|P\| < \|C\| \quad \text{as } \|P\| < 1.$$

This shows that $C = 0$ and consequently $C_1 = C_2$. ☐

For a polynomially convex compact subset X of $\mathbb{C}^d$ and a tuple of commuting bounded operators $\underline{A} = (A_1, \ldots, A_d)$ on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{H}$, a normal ∂X-dilation $\underline{N} = (N_1, \ldots, N_d)$ is a tuple of commuting bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathscr{K} \supseteq \mathscr{H}$ such that the Taylor joint spectrum $\sigma_T(\underline{N}) \subseteq \partial X$ and

$$p(\underline{A}) = P_{\mathscr{H}}\, p(\underline{N})|_{\mathscr{H}}, \qquad \text{for any } p \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \ldots, z_d].$$

It is clear that if $\underline{A}$ has a normal ∂X-dilation, then X is a spectral set for $\underline{A}$. In general, it is difficult to determine the converse, i.e, if X is a spectral set for A then whether or not $\underline{A}$ has a normal ∂X-dilation. It was shown by Agler and Young that a pair of commuting bounded operators (S,P) has Γ as a spectral set if and only if it has a normal ∂X-dilation. One of the contributions of this paper has been to add that Γ is a spectral set for a commuting pair (S,P) if and only if the fundamental equation for (S,P) can be solved with a solution of numerical radius not greater than one.

Acknowledgement. We are thankful to Professor Gadadhar Misra for stimulating conversations.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Agler and N. J. Young, A commutant lifting theorem for a domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and spectral interpolation , *J. Funct. Anal.* 161 (1999), 452-477.

[2] J. Agler and N. J. Young, Operators having the symmetrized bidisc as a spectral set, *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society* 43 (2000), 195-210.

[3] J. Agler and N. J. Young, The two-point spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem, *Integral Equations Operator Theory* 37 (2000), 375-385.

[4] J. Agler and N. J. Young, A schwarz lemma for symmetrized bidisc, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* 33 (2001), 175-186.

[5] J. Agler and N. J. Young, The two-by-two spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 356 (2003), 573-585.

[6] J. Agler and N. J. Young, A model theory for Γ-contractions, *J. Operator Theory* 49 (2003), 45-60.

[7] J. Agler and N. J. Young, The hyperbolic geometry of the symmetrized bidisc, *J. Geom. Anal.* 14 (2004), 375-403.

[8] T. Ando, Structure of operators with numerical radius one, *Acta Sci. Math. (szeged)*, 34 (1973), 11-15.

[9] J. B. Conway, The Theory of Subnormal Operators, *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 36, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 1991.

[10] R. E. Curto, Applications of several complex variables to multiparameter spectral theory, Surveys of Some Recent Results in Operator Theory, Vol. II, *Pitman Res. Notes Math. Ser., Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow*, 192(1988), 25-90.

[11] R. G. Douglas, G. Misra and J. Sarkar, Contractive Hilbert modules and their dilations, *arXiv:0907.0026, v4 [math.FA] 9 Apr 2010.*

[12] R. G. Douglas, P.S. Muhly and Carl Pearcy, Lifting Commuting Operators, *Michigan Math. J.*, 15 (1968), 385-395.

[13] M. A.Dritschel and S. McCullough, The failure of rational dilation on a triply connected domain, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 18 (2005), 873-918.

[14] M. A. Dritschel and J. Rovnyak, The operator Fejér-Riesz theorem, chapter in A glimpse at Hilbert space operators: Paul R. Halmos in Memorium, Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., 207, pages 223 - 254, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2010.

[15] A. Edigarian and W. Zwonek, Geometry of symmetrized polydisc, *Archiv der Mathematik* 84 (2005), 364-374.

[16] B.A. Francis, A Course in H^∞ Control Theory, *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., vol. 88, Springer Verlag, Berlin*, 1987.

[17] T. Gamelin, Uniform Algebras, *Prentice-Hall, New Jersey*, 1969.

[18] D. Hong-Ke and P. Jin, Perturbation of spectrums of 2×2 operator matrices, *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 121 (1994), 761-766.

[19] G. Misra, S. Shyam Roy and G. Zhang, Reproducing kernel for a class of weighted Bergman spaces on the symmetrized polydisc, to appear in Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., available at *arXiv:1106.3868, v1 [math.FA] 20 Jun 2011*.

[20] Bela Sz.-Nagy, C. Foias, H. Bercovici, L. Kerchy, Harmonic Analysis of Operators on Hilbert Space, Universitext, *Springer, New York*, 2010.

[21] V. Paulsen, Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras, *Cambridge University Press*, 2002.

[22] M. Rosenblum, Vectorial Toeplitz operator and the Fejér-Riesz theorem, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 23 (1968), 139-147.

[23] F. H. Vasilescu, Analytic Functional Calculus and Spectral Decompositions, *Editura Academiei: Bucuresti, Romania and D. Reidel Publishing Company*, 1982.

(Bhattacharyya) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANAGLORE 560 012
E-mail address: `tirtha@member.ams.org`

(Pal) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANAGLORE 560 012
E-mail address: `sourav@math.iisc.ernet.in`

(ShyamRoy) INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, PIN CODE 741252, NADIA, WEST BENGAL
E-mail address: `ssroy@iiserkol.ac.in`